DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 279 HE 017 154

AUTHOR Matross, Ron; Roesler, Jon
TITLE Transferring to the University of Minnesota: A Survey of Admitted CLA Transfer Students.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Office for Student Affairs.
PUB DATE 4 Apr 83
NOTE 52p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
JOURNAL CIT OSA Research Bulletin; v23 n2 Apr 4 83

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Choice; *College Transfer Students; Comparative Analysis; Decision Making; *Enrollment Influences; Higher Education; Information Sources; Institutional Research; Liberal Arts; Questionnaires; State Universities; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *University of Minnesota Minneapolis

ABSTRACT

Attitudes about the University of Minnesota and characteristics of 384 students who applied to transfer to the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) were studied. It was found that 285 of the respondents enrolled in CLA for fall 1982, and 57 did not. When asked their reasons for enrolling or not enrolling, respondents most often cited the availability of a particular program of study, as well as costs and the location of the school. Respondents were also asked to rate CLA on 16 characteristics in comparison with other universities they knew about. Both enrollees and nonenrollees gave the university above average marks on 14 of the 16 characteristics. The two that were given below average ratings were availability of financial aid and housing. Highest ratings were given to academic reputation and course availability and variety. Factor analysis suggested that the most important factor in determining ratings of the college was a campus environment factor (location, housing, social climate, student population). Students were asked whether various information sources had a positive or negative influence on their desire to attend the university. Results suggest a two-stage model of how potential transfer students decide about attending the university. Based on the research, seven recommendations for the college were offered. The questionnaire is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OSA Research Bulletin
Office for Student Affairs
University of Minnesota
Volume 23
Number 2
Date 04/04/83

OSA

ED242279

TRANSFERRING TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA: A SURVEY OF ADMITTED CLA TRANSFER STUDENTS

RON MATROSS

AND

JON ROESLER

DATA AND REPORTING SERVICES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND SERVICES
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, TWIN CITIES

HE 017 154

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ron Matross

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While this report was authored by Data and Reporting Services, the actual conduct of the study reported here was done by Lou Branca, of the University Prospective Students Office. He conceived of the study, and did the main part of the work in coordinating and mailing it. Data and Reporting Services consulted on the design of the study, did the analyses and authored the report.

Support for the study (and a great deal of patience) were provided by John Printz, head of the Prospective Students Office.

Finally, credit should be given to the Data Entry and Word Processing staff in Information Systems and Services, who keyed the surveys and prepared the manuscript.

CLA ADMITTED TRANSFER SURVEY

Ron Matross and Jon Roesler
Data and Reporting Services
University of Minnesota

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Three hundred and eighty four students who applied to transfer to the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) for the Fall of 1982 were surveyed on their characteristics and attitudes toward the University of Minnesota. Key findings included the following:

Characteristics of Enrollees and Nonenrollees

Two hundred and eighty five of the respondents enrolled in CLA for Fall 82, and 57 did not. The two groups differed in several respects:

Four out of five enrollees applied ONLY to the University of Minnesota CLA. Nonenrollees were much more likely to apply elsewhere. Two out of three nonenrollees were attending another college.

Nonenrollees had more college experience than did the enrollees. Ninety-eight percent of the nonenrollees transferred more than 84 credits, compared to only 36% of the enrollees.

Nonenrollees reported higher personal incomes than did enrollees. Over a third (35%) said that they earned $10,000 or more compared to only 6% among enrollees.

Nonenrollees were less likely to have applied for financial aid at the U of M (49% vs. 57% for enrollees) and to have been offered aid (17% vs. 36%). However, over half the nonenrollees (58%) did say they were receiving aid from another school.

Reasons for the Enrollment Decision

When asked their reasons for enrolling or not enrolling, respondents most often cited one academic reason, availability of a particular program of study, and two non-academic reasons--costs and the location of the school. These same three reasons were most often cited by both enrollees and nonenrollees, as attractions in one case, and obstacles in the other. A number of nonenrollees also cited other non-academic reasons for not enrolling--their personal circumstances and University "red tape"

Evaluations of the University of Minnesota

Respondents were asked to rate the University of Minnesota (CLA) on 16 characteristics in comparison with other universities they knew about. Both enrollees

and nonenrollees gave the University above average marks on 14 of the 16 characteristics. The two which were given below average ratings were availability of financial aid and housing. Highest ratings were given to academic reputation and course availability and variety. Compared to enrollees, nonenrollees gave lower ratings to campus location and program availability and higher ratings to labs and classrooms, entrance requirements, campus activities, and social climate.

A factor analysis suggested that the most important factor in determining ratings of the U of M was a campus environment factor, represented by campus location, housing, social climate, and the number of students on campus. Although rated very positively, a prestige factor, represented by academic reputation and prestige of a U of M degree, was a less important determinant of respondent judgments.

Responses to open-ended questions about the most positive and negative features of the University produced a pattern similar to the ratings. The most positive features were academic--program availability and quality, while the most frequently cited negative features were environmental--size, social climate, and "red tape"

Information Sources

Respondents were asked whether various information sources had a positive or negative influence on their desire to attend the University. Both groups attributed the greatest inducement to attend to catalogs and campus visits and the least inducement to conversations with University faculty, staff, and admissions counselors. However,the data did not allow a clear separation of persons who received information from a source and were not influenced by it from those who did not receive information from that source.

Enrollees and non-enrollees gave similar responses, differing only in that enrollees said they received more positive influence from parents and friends attending the U of M, and more negative influence from previous school advisers.

A factor analysis of the 12 influence items found that the most important positive influence on respondents was their personal impression of the University, as conveyed through campus visits and personal conversations with persons at the University.

Analysis: A Model of the Choice Process

The data from this study suggest a two-stage model of how potential transfer students make their decision about attending the University. In the first stage, students are initially attracted by academic factors--the University's reputation, prestige, and diversity of programs. These characteristics, which were highly rated by both enrollees and non- enrollees essentially put the University into the running as one of the possibilities being seriously considered by the student.

However, in the second stage, the actual making of a decision, environmental issues become paramount. As suggested by the factor analyses, questions of housing, costs, location, and campus environment may be most important in determining whether the individual actually does enroll.

The characteristics of the nonenrollees (although a small sample) suggest that many are "non-traditional"--older students with more credits, more responsibilities, and less mobility. Despite their positive view of the academic quality of the University, these students may be dissuaded by the difficulties they see in arranging housing, jobs, and other practical matters associated with going to school.

Thus CLA may be attracting the younger transfers who find it relatively easy to get housing, jobs and aid, and losing the older student who has a harder time dealing with the logistics of attending the University.

Recommendations

The data suggest that the University should work to continue drawing the traditional transfer students who appreciate its prestige and diversity, and find new ways to attract the non-traditional students who are dissuaded by problems in coping with aspects of the environment. Specifically, the University might consider the following:

1. Strongly encourage personal visits to the University and conversations with students, faculty, and staff. Personal impressions were the most important influence sources. It seems possible that a number of non-enrollees are operating on stereotypes of the University, which might be corrected by first-hand knowledge.

2. The content of personal visits should emphasize environmental factors, not just academic factors. By and large, aspects of the environment, not the curriculum, seem to be dissuading non-enrollees. Special efforts might be made to have prospective students learn how other transfers have dealt with housing, finances, jobs, and parking. Recent transfers especially older "nontraditional" students, might be recruited to talk with prospective students about these issues. At the same time, University representatives from student service offices might talk with students about how the University can aid their coping. Ways of personalizing the University experience should also be discussed, since size is clearly a negative association with the University for many prospects.

3. University representatives should make sure that their contacts with prospective students are helpful and positive. Enough students complained of "red tape" and brusque treatment to justify more attention to the quality of contacts.

4. Catalogs and viewbooks should continue to emphasize the quality and diversity of the University's academic programs. For most students the University's basic publications were an attractive and reassuring statement of the prestige and quality of the institution. This strength should be consolidated and maintained.

5. New publications should be targeted toward coping with environmental issues. Since it is not possible for all prospective transfers to visit the campus, the University should publish something which directly deals with students' concerns about coping with the campus environment. The publication should creatively talk about ways in which students can find housing, jobs, aid, child care, parking, commuter services, and personal

friendships on the campus. The publication should accurately portray the extent to which the University actively helps transfer students adjust to the Twin Cities Campus. Explicit mention should be made of the needs of "non-traditional" students. The suggested material could be incorporated into the Transfer Guide or put into a separate publication.

6. Contacts with advisers at feeder schools should be enhanced. A number of non-enrollees listed conversations with persons at feeder schools as negative influences on their desire to attend the U of M. Particular attention should be paid to informing advisers about the ways in which students can cope with the University environment and receive personal attention at the University. Given the positive ratings that students assigned to the academic aspects of the University, it is unlikely that feeder school advisers are giving prospective students negative information about the University's curricula. It is more likely that they are telling prospective students negative things about the impersonality of the University and the difficulties to be encountered in coping with the size and location of the institution. Some advisers' impressions may also be based on stereotypes, and might be changed with better information from the University.

7. Finally, the University should examine the substance of student services, not just their image. It is all very well for the University to improve its image as helpful and personal place, but it should also examine the housing, financial aid, admissions processing, and other services which actually deal with aiding student adjustment. To the extent that offices can improve their services to transfer students, particularly "non-traditional" ones, then they should do so.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary i

Introduction/Methods 1

Results

Reasons for Enrollment Decision 4

Influence of Information Sources 6

Impressions of UM Characteristics 15

Respondent Demographic Characteristics 28

Discussion 33

Appendix: Questionnaires 37

CLA ADMITTED TRANSFER STUDENT SURVEY

Ronald Matross and Jon Roesler

Data and Reporting Services

This is the report of a survey of admitted transfer students to the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. The survey was commissioned by the Prospective Students Office in Student Support Services, and was conducted by the Prospective Students Office and Data and Reporting Services.

At issue were the following questions:

Why do some students who are admitted as transfer students choose not to enroll? Do their reasons for not attending stem from something about the University or do they stem from life circumstances and other factors beyond the University's control?

What are the characteristics of students who do and do not enroll in the quarter for which they are admitted? Are there systematic differences between enrollees and nonenrollees in terms of their sex, geographic origin, or income?

What are the attitudes of potential transfer students toward the University of Minnesota? What do they see as the positive features? The negative features? Do enrollees and non-enrollees differ in their attitudes?

What might the University do to make itself more attractive to potential transfer students? Do admitted transfer students have suggestions on changes that the University might make to improve its service to this group?

The motivation for addressing these questions was the desire of the Prospective Students Office to improve the University's services to potential transfer students. The survey was designed to suggest specific directions which these improvement efforts might take.

The context for seeking enhancements to transfer student services is the expectation of enrollment declines over the next decade among traditional new college students (aged 18-22), as well as increasingly aggressive competition for students among all types of colleges. One way the University might make up for declines in enrollments among new high school students is to attract more transfer students. It is thus in both the interest of students and of the University that the institution enhance its work with potential transfer students.

PROCEDURES

Sample and Response Rates

The survey was conducted by mail in May and June of 1982 among two samples of students admitted as advanced standing (transfer) students to the College of Liberal Arts for Fall Quarter, 1981. One sample (N=142) was all the students

who applied to transfer for the Fall Quarter, but who did not enroll for that quarter. The other sample was an every Nth name systematic sample of 596 students (out of approximately 2,000) who did enroll for the Fall Quarter.

Each group was sent a four-page questionnaire and one to three follow-up reminders, depending on when they responded. All mailings were sent first class. Valid responses were received from 57 of the non-enrollees (a response rate of 40.1%) and from 285 of the enrollees (a response rate of 47.8%). The response rates suggest that caution should be exercised in interpretation of the survey findings. It is possible that systematic biases might exist in the data due to the characteristics of the respondents. For example, those who were most negative toward the University might not have responded.

Given the nature of the questionnaire and the number of follow-ups used, the relatively low response rate might be plausibly attributed either to inadequate addresses or to respondents' lack of motivation with respect to the survey. The University has instituted a computerized registration procedure which does not allow for address updating at the time of registration. Consequently a number of students may not have received the questionnaire, or it may have been mailed to a parent address and not given to the student. This latter number might be much larger than the 18 which were returned by the post office as not forwardable. The motivational factor may have come into play because of the timing of the study. Because they had made their transfer decisions sometime earlier (almost a year) they may have not been highly motivated to complete a questionnaire asking about their decision and their views of the University.

Questionnaire Items

Two different four-page questionnaires were constructed for the enrollees and non-enrollees. The content of the two forms was similar, differing only with respect to background and open-ended items.

On both forms the first question was an open-ended one asking why the student did or did not enroll at the U of M/CLA. A series of 12 items then asked the extent to which various factors (U of M literature, contacts with U of M staff, and advice from other people) increased or decreased the individual's desire to attend the U of M. A series of 16 items asked the respondent to rate the quality of various aspects of the University of Minnesota CLA compared to other four year colleges. Items covered included academics, costs, social life, and physical facilities.

The next items were open-ended questions concerning the most positive and most negative features of the University in the respondent's view. Then those who did enroll were asked whether they would enroll if they had it to do over again, and those who did not enroll were asked whether they planned to attend the University in the future.

The final set of items asked students factual questions about their background and attendance patterns. These included a listing of the colleges to which the individual applied to for transfer besides the University of Minnesota, whether any of these colleges offered financial aid, and whether the U of M offered

financial aid. Non-enrollees were asked whether they were attending college somewhere else, and if so, the name of the college. Lastly, all students were asked their own and their parents' incomes, and whether they had suggestions for how the University might provide better service to potential transfer students.

Copies of both forms of the questionnaire are appended to the end of the report.

Data Analysis/Report Format

The results of the survey are presented in sections according to question type: Stated reasons for enrolling or not enrolling; influences on the enrollment decision; evaluations of the University of Minnesota; college application choices; and background characteristics and comments about the University. Within each section item by item data tables are presented along with verbal descriptions of the findings. The tables present the percentage responses of enrollees and nonenrollees separately and combined.

Where appropriate, the tables also give summary statistics and the results of tests of significance of the difference between the enrollee and non-enrollee groups on a given item. The signficance test used is the F test, which indicates whether a difference between means (averages) is likely to have occurred by chance. Where the test indicates that the result is unlikely to have occurred by chance ($P<.05$), the reader may be reasonably confident that a difference is "real". Also included is a correlational statistic, eta squared, which portrays the strength of the relationship between enrollment and responses to the survey item. In general, eta squared values of .25 or more (equivalent to a Pearson correlation of .50 or more) indicate relatively strong relationships, while values lower than .25 indicate relatively weaker relationships.

In addition two other analyses were conducted. First, open-ended responses to items on the main reason for attending or not attending the University were coded, and statistics were computed. Secondly, factor analyses were performed on responses to the 12 items rating the influence of various information sources and responses to the 16 items rating the quality of aspects of the University and CLA.

The purposes of the factor analyses were to determine underlying dimensions explaining the influence and quality ratings, and the relative importance of each dimension. In many respects the factor analyses were a statistical, rather than a direct way of asking about the main reasons for not attending.

The factor analysis method used was principal factors analysis (SPSS PA 2), using listwise deletion, multiple correlation coefficients as communality estimates and orthogonal rotation. What this analysis does is reduce a larger set of items into smaller sets based on the correlations among the items. The result is a group of factors, each composed of items which correlate fairly highly with each other, but relatively little with items in other factors. Within each factor, the relationship of each item to the factor is indicated by the factor loading, the correlation of the item with the factor (ranging from 0 to 1).

The factor analysis also indicates the relative importance of each item factor in explaining the variance in the total set of items. This is indicated by the communality statistic which also ranges from 0 to 1. The square of the communality gives the amount of explainable variance in the responses attributable to each factor.

For the factor analyses the responses of the enrollees and nonenrollees were combined in order to achieve a number of subjects large enough for the analysis. It would have been desirable to have conducted separate analyses for the enrollees and nonenrollees, but this was not possible. Thus the factor analyses will primarily reflect the responses of the enrollees, and the relative importance of various items in their attitudes toward the University. The relative importance of items for the non-enrollees alone might be different.

Following the data results sections an analysis of the results and their possible programmatic implications is provided.

RESULTS

Stated Reasons for the Enrollment Decision

Tables 1 and 2 present the coded responses to the open-ended item asking students their main reason for enrolling or not enrolling. Interestingly, the same three factors most frequently mentioned by enrollees as reasons why they enrolled were also the ones most frequently mentioned by non-enrollees as reasons why they did not enroll. The location of the school (MN, Twin Cities) was the most frequent reason given by enrollees (40.6%) and the second most frequent reason given by non-enrollees.(19.6%). Similarly, the cost of attending the University was the most frequently cited reason among non-enrollees (21.1%) and the third most frequent reason for enrollees (24%). The availabiliy of a particular program or field of study was an important attraction for 36% of the enrollees, but a detracting factor for 19.6% of the non-enrollees. In general, then, the same factors which attracted one group of potential students (cost, location, and programs) dissuaded another group.

Non-enrollees also cited several factors related to their personal circumstances to explain their decision not to come to the University. These included choosing not to attend college at all, choosing another school which would better accomodate continuing on a present job, and a variety of miscellaneous, primarily personal, factors.

The one factor which clearly stood out as within the potential control of the University was "red tape", a reason cited by 8.9% of the nonenrollees. A small, but possibly important segment of the transfer student market may be driven away by the complexity or slowness of the procedures involved in being admitted and registered for University classes.

Table 1

Percentage Distribution of Enrollees' Main Reasons for Attending the U of M

Response	Percent Responding (n=283)
Reasons Relating to:	
Location	40.6
Major/Field/Location	36.0
Expenses/Finances	24.0
Reputation/Quality	18.0
Previous Attendance at U	1.4
Miscellaneous	15.5

Note: Respondents were allowed to give two reasons, so percentages total to more than 100%.

Table 2

Percentage Distribution of Non-enrollees' Main Reasons for Not Attending the U of M

Response	Percent Responding (n=56)
Reasons Relating to:	
Expense/Finances	21.4
Location	19.6
Major/Field/Program	19.6
Job vs. School	14.3
Administration/Red Tape	8.9
Not Attending Any School	8.9
Finding Job in Field	5.4
Reputation/Qaulity	1.8
Miscellaneous	19.6

Note: Respondents were allowed to give two reasons, so percentages total to more than 100%.

Ratings of the Influence of Information Sources

Another way in which the survey sought to understand the influences on transfer students' enrollment decisions was through a series of items asking respondents to rate the extent to which various types of information about the University increased or decreased their desire to attend. The rating scale went from 1 to 5 for each item, starting with 1=strongly increased, 2=slightly increased, 3=had no effect, 4=slightly decreased, 5=strongly decreased.

Table 3 presents a summary of the average responses of the enrollees, nonenrollees, and the two groups combined, as well as an indication of significant differences between the enrollees and nonenrollees. Tables 4-19 detail the percentage breakdowns of each group's response to each of the items.

Overall, response patterns of enrollees and nonenrollees were highly similar. Both groups attributed the greatest inducement to attend (as indicated by lower scores) to catalogs and campus visits, and the least inducement to attend to talks with University faculty, staff, and admissions counselors. All of the sources listed were seen by most respondents as either increasing their desire to attend or not having had an effect. Compared to nonenrollees, enrollees rated advice from U of M friends and from parents as having a significantly greater positive influence on their desire to attend the the U of M/CLA.

Further understanding can be gained of respondents' perceptions of the effects of information types through inspection of the percentage breakdowns for each item shown in Tables 4-15. Tables 6 and 8 show in percentage terms the extent to which the groups differed in their views of the impact of advice from friends and parents. Well over half the enrollees (54.5%) said that advice from friends at the U of M greatly or slightly increased their desire to attend the U of M. On the other hand, less than a third (29.1%) of the nonenrollees said that talking with U of M friends increased their desire to attend, and 12.8% said that friends decreased their desire to attend (compared to 8.1% among enrollees).

A similar pattern was found with respect to parents' advice. Among enrollees, 42.8% said that parental advice increased their desire to attend the U of M versus 16.7% among nonenrollees. Conversely, 9.3% of the nonenrollees said that parental advice decreased their desire to attend versus 5.3% of the enrollees.

For some of the other information sources not showing significant differences between enrollees and nonenrollees, there may still be differences not revealed by the means or the analyses of variance. (This is due to the fact that assumptions regarding normal distribution were not met). In other words, some of the sources may not be as neutral as the mean scores make them appear. For instance, with regard to ratings of conversations with the U of M admissions office, no overall significant difference was found. However, the number of nonenrollees who said that these conversations decreased their desire to attend (25.4%) was about 11% higher than among the enrollees (14.4%). Correspondingly, the nonenrollees also showed a larger proportion who said admissions counselors increased their desire to attend (21.9% vs. 18.3%) and lower proportion saying they had no effect (52.7% vs. 67.4%).

Further ordinal level nonparametric statistics might reveal differences for this and other items regarding the effects of advice from other people such as U of M faculty and counselors from the previous college.

Unfortunately, the response format of the items did not allow for the separation of persons who were not exposed to an information source from those who were exposed but for whom it had no effect. Had the questions allowed this separation, inferences might be stronger.

Nevertheless the data do suggest some hypotheses about how the University might have more influence on the prospective transfer students's choices. First, it may be that simply more information is better than less information. It is possible that nonenrollees do not get information from as many sources as do enrollees. This may be particularly true with regard to direct personal sources of information, such as advice from current U of M friends, or parents, or faculty. It might be that a greater proportion of students would enroll if they could be heard about the University from more sources.

There is some risk involved in giving students more information about the University. The wider variation of both positive and negative effects among nonenrollees with regard to some of information sources suggests that some sources have tended to persuade some students out of coming at the same time they persuade others into coming. However, in the long run, a better or more fully informed choice would be in the best interests of both the University and the student.

Another hypothesis worth investigating in further research is the possibility of a two-stage model of the effects of information sources. Printed material, as indicated by the high ratings of catalogs, may be important in the early stage of a students' interest in enrolling. The written materials, in effect, put the University into the competition for the student's enrollment. After a period of initial favorable interest, however, interpersonal sources of information may become more important, and may help make the difference between enrolling or not enrolling (as suggested by the differences in ratings of these sources).

Some additional support for this hypothesis comes from a factor analysis of the influence source items (Table 15). The first factor extracted is labeled personal impressions, and includes conversations with U of M faculty, visits by U of M staff to the applicant's school, visits to the U of M, and conversations with U of M Admissions staff. This factor accounted for 47% of the explainable variance, in the influence items. The second factor was a publications factor including the U of M catalog and brochures/viewbooks. This factor accounted for 24% of the explainable variance, and was thus the second most important. The other two factors extracted, were previous college advice and U of M students' advice.

The two factors which appear most important in the ratings, personal impressions and publications, fit the two stage model just described. However, it should be remembered that the factor analysis is dominated by the enrollees. Other factors, particularly the advice factors, may have been relatively more important for the non-enrollees in persuading them not to enroll. The analyses of differences on the individual items do, in fact, suggest this possibility.

Table 3

Summary of Mean Responses
Rating the U of M's Information Sources

Information Source	Total	Group: Enrollee	Group: Non-Enrollee
Visits to the U of M	2.21	2.18	2.35
U of M catalog	2.32	2.33	2.26
*Advice from U of M friends	2.40	2.33	2.78
U of M brochures/viewbook	2.58	2.60	2.49
*Advice from parents	2.60	2.55	2.91
U of M transfer guide	2.65	2.65	2.68
Advice from U of M alumni	2.74	2.72	2.85
Advice from faculty	2.80	2.80	2.80
Advice from a counselor	2.81	2.80	2.85
U of M faculty	2.85	2.84	2.93
U of M admissions office	2.98	2.97	3.02
Visits by U of M staff	2.99	2.99	3.00

*$p \leq .05$

Table 4

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of the U of M Catalog
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=338)	Group: Enrollee (N=284)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=54)
Strongly Increased	1	13.6	12.7	18.5
Slightly Increased	2	43.2	43.3	42.6
No Effect	3	40.8	42.3	33.3
Slightly Decreased	4	2.1	1.4	5.6
Strongly Decreased	5	.3	.4	0
Mean		2.32	2.33	2.26
Standard Deviation		.74	.73	.83

Note. $p = .50$. Eta squared = 0.

Table 5

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of the U of M Brochure/Viewbook
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=340)	Group: Enrollee (N=285)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=55)
Strongly Increased	1	4.7	4.2	7.3
Slightly Increased	2	32.9	32.3	36.4
No Effect	3	61.8	62.8	56.4
Slightly Decreased	4	.6	.7	0
Strongly Decreased	5	0	0	0
Mean		2.58	2.60	2.49
Standard Deviation		.59	.58	.63

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .21. Eta squared = 0.

Table 6

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of the U of M Transfer Guide
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=336)	Group: Enrollee (N=283)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=53)
Strongly Increased	1	8.0	8.1	7.5
Slightly Increased	2	28.3	28.3	28.3
No Effect	3	56.5	56.5	56.6
Slightly Decreased	4	4.5	4.6	3.8
Strongly Decreased	5	2.7	2.5	3.8
Mean		2.65	2.65	2.68
Standard Deviation		.80	.80	.83

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .81. Eta squared = 0.

Table 7

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of Advice from Friends at the U of M
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=339)	Group: Enrollee (N=284)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=55)
Strongly Increased	1	19.8	21.5	10.9
Slightly Increased	2	30.7	33.1	18.2
No Effect	3	40.7	37.3	58.2
Slightly Decreased	4	7.1	7.0	7.3
Strongly Decreased	5	1.8	1.1	5.5
Mean		2.40	2.33	2.78
Standard Deviation		.94	.93	.94

Note. $\underline{P}$ = 0. Eta Squared = .03.

Table 8

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of Advice from U of M Alumni
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=340)	Group: Enrollee (N=285)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=55)
Strongly Increased	1	7.4	7.7	5.5
Slightly Increased	2	12.9	14.4	5.5
No Effect	3	78.5	76.8	87.3
Slightly Decreased	4	.9	.7	1.8
Strongly Decreased	5	.3	.4	0
Mean		2.74	2.72	2.85
Standard Deviation		.61	.63	.52

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .13. Eta squared = .01.

Table 9

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of Advice from Parents
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=339)	Group: Enrollee (N=285)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=54)
Strongly Increased	1	8.0	8.4	5.6
Slightly Increased	2	30.7	34.4	11.1
No Effect	3	55.5	51.9	74.1
Slightly Decreased	4	4.7	4.6	5.6
Strongly Decreased	5	1.2	.7	3.7
Mean		2.60	2.55	2.91
Standard Deviation		.75	.74	.73

Note. $\underline{P}$ = 0. Eta squared = .03.

Table 10

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of Advice from a Counselor at the Previous College
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=340)	Group: Enrollee (N=285)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=55)
Strongly Increased	1	4.7	4.2	7.3
Slightly Increased	2	16.5	17.9	9.1
No Effect	3	72.4	71.9	74.5
Slightly Decreased	4	5.9	5.3	9.1
Strongly Decreased	5	.6	.7	0
Mean		2.81	2.80	2.85
Standard Deviation		.63	.63	.68

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .59. Eta squared = 0.

Table 11

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of Advice from Faculty at the Previous College
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=340)	Group: Enrollee (N=285)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=55)
Strongly Increased	1	5.9	5.6	7.3
Slightly Increased	2	16.8	16.8	16.4
No Effect	3	70.3	71.2	65.5
Slightly Decreased	4	5.9	4.9	10.9
Strongly Decreased	5	1.2	1.4	0
Mean		2.80	2.80	2.80
Standard Deviation		.68	.68	.73

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .97. Eta squared = 0.

Table 12

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of Respondent's Visits to the U of M
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=340)	Group: Enrollee (N=285)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=55)
Strongly Increased	1	22.9	23.5	20.0
Slightly Increased	2	40.0	41.1	34.5
No Effect	3	31.2	29.8	38.2
Slightly Decreased	4	5.0	4.9	5.5
Strongly Decreased	5	.9	.7	1.8
Mean		2.21	2.18	2.35
Standard Deviation		.88	.87	.93

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .21. Eta squared = 0.

Table 13

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of Conversations with U of M Faculty
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=340)	Group: Enrollee (N=285)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=55)
Strongly Increased	1	4.4	4.2	5.5
Slightly Increased	2	13.8	13.0	18.2
No Effect	3	75.9	78.2	63.6
Slightly Decreased	4	3.8	3.9	3.6
Strongly Decreased	5	2.1	.7	9.1
Mean		2.85	2.84	2.93
Standard Deviation		.64	.58	.90

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .35. Eta squared = 0.

Table 14

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of Visits by U of M Staff
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=340)	Group: Enrollee (N=285)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=55)
Strongly Increased	1	.3	.4	0
Slightly Increased	2	1.8	2.1	0
No Effect	3	96.8	96.1	100.0
Slightly Decreased	4	.9	1.1	0
Strongly Decreased	5	.3	.4	0
Mean		2.99	2.99	3.00
Standard Deviation		.22	.24	0

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .75. Eta squared = 0.

Table 15

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Effect of Conversations with the U of M Admissions Office
on Respondent's Desire to Attend the U of M

Response	Value	Total (N=340)	Group: Enrollee (N=285)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=55)
Strongly Increased	1	4.1	3.9	5.5
Slightly Increased	2	14.7	14.4	16.4
No Effect	3	65.0	67.4	52.7
Slightly Decreased	4	11.5	9.5	21.8
Strongly Decreased	5	4.7	4.9	3.6
Mean		2.98	2.97	3.02
Standard Deviation		.79	.77	.87

Note. P = .69. Eta squared = 0.

Table 16

Results of Factor Analysis on Information Source Items

	LOADING	PERCENT OF COMMON VARIANCE
Factor I: Personal Impressions		46.9
Conversations with U of M faculty	.52	
Visits by U of M staff to your school	.50	
Conversations with U of M Admissions Office	.46	
Your own visits to the U of M	.46	
Subscale mean = 2.75 ± .45		
Factor II: Printed Material		24.2
University of Minnesota catalog	.86	
U of M brochures/viewbook	.40	
Subscale mean = 2.44 ± .55		
Factor III: Previous College Advice		18.5
Advice from faculty at your previous college	.76	
Advice from a counselor at your previous college	.55	
Subscale mean = 2.81 ± .57		
Factor IV: U of M Students Advice		10.4
Advice from friends at U of M	.49	
Advice from U of M alumni	.45	
Subscale mean = 2.56 ± .63		

Note. N = 382

Impression of U of M Characteristics

Both enrollees and nonenrollees were asked to rate 16 aspects of the U of M on a scale from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (superior), with 3 being average. In general, the respondents rated the U of M favorably. On only two of the items, availability of financial aid and availability of housing, did respondents give a rating of 'below average' (mean scores of 2.98 and 2.77, respectively). The U of M was given its highest ratings on its variety of courses offered, availability of particular programs of study, and academic reputation (mean scores of 4.42, 4.15, and 4.12, respectively). The 16 impression items are summarized on Table 17 ordered from the highest to the lowest mean scores. The percentage distribution of responses for each of the 16 items is given in Tables 18 to 33.

Enrollees and nonenrollees differed significantly on 5 items (p less than or equal to .05). Of these 5 items, nonenrollees ranked the U of M higher than did enrollees in: labs and other classroom facilities; social climate and campus activities; and college entrance requirements (see Tables 32, 29, and 24). Enrollees ranked the U of M higher than did nonenrollees on the availability of a particular program of study, and the location of the campus. (See Tables 19 and 28). The differance in this last item (location of the campus) is consistent with the main reasons given by the respondents for either enrolling or not enrolling at the U of M (Tables 11 and 22).

A factor analysis was performed on the 16 impression items to determine whether there might be some general attitudinal dimensions underlying the respondents' ratings. Table 34 presents the results of the factor analysis and the subsequent tests of reliability on the factor scores. Given for each factor is the suggested underlying dimension, the percentage common variance, those items that loaded at 0.30 or higher, the factor loading score, the additive scale score with its standard deviation, and the reliability coefficient, alpha.

The factor analysis yielded a 4-factor solution accounting for 50.8% of the total variance. Of the initial 17 items, 15 loaded on these factors at .30 or higher. Three items loaded at this level on more than one factor. Factor I, labeled overall environment, was represented by seven items giving impressions of various aspects of the U of M environment. Items loading high on this factor were availability of housing, and social climate and campus activities. This dimension accounted for 54.0% of the common variance of the 17 items. Factor II, prestige, was represented by three items. The items loading highest were prestige of a U of M degree, and academic reputation. This factor accounted for 21.7% of the common variance. Factor III, availability, was represented by 3 items, the highest loading being variety of courses offered. This factor accounted for 14.2% of the common variance. Factor IV, affordability, was represented by 5 items giving the impressions of items affecting the cost of attending. The highest loading item for this factor was availability of financial aid. This factor accounted for 10.2% of the common variance. The highest impression subscale score was for the availability factor (4.18) followed by the prestige factor (3.94), the overall environment (3.48) and the affordability (3.36).

Again, the importance of the overall environment factor is consistent with the main reasons given for either attending or not attending the U of M (Tables 11

and 22). Enrollees cited reasons relating to the location of the campus as the most important reason for attending the U of M. Likewise, nonenrollees cited the location as the second main reason for not attending the U of M.

The two highest rated factors, availability and prestige, were reflected in the respondents descriptions of the most positive or appealing features of the U of M (Table 35). Respondents had cited the quality/prestige and the number of courses/programs as the two most positive features of the U of M.

The third most positive feature of the U of M (rated second by enrollees) was its size. Almost twice the proportion of enrollees considered this the most positive feature than did nonenrollees (22.0% vs. 11.5%). In contrast to this, the most frequent choice for the most negative feature (Table 36), by both enrollees and nonenrollees, was the U of M's impersonalness/size (46.1% and 50.0%, respectively). The red tape at the U came in a distant second. However, enrollees tended to view red tape as more of a problem than did nonenrollees (19.9% vs. 8.0%). Perhaps this is because they had had the opportunity to deal with the U of M's beauracracy while the nonenrollees had not.

Table 17

Summary of Mean Responses
Rating the Respondents' Impressions of the U of M

Characteristic Rated	Total	Group	
		Enrollee	Non-Enrollee
Variety of courses offered	4.42	4.45	4.30
*Availability of programs	4.15	4.20	3.83
Academic reputation	4.12	4.13	4.06
Campus libraries	3.94	3.94	3.96
Prestige of U of M degree	3.87	3.89	3.75
*Location of the campus	3.87	3.95	3.48
Reputation of faculty	3.77	3.76	3.79
Number of students	3.73	3.76	3.53
*Labs and classrooms	3.44	3.37	3.88
Credit transferability	3.37	3.37	3.37
Opportunities for work	3.32	3.34	3.18
*Social climate/activities	3.28	3.23	3.55
*Entrance requirements	3.23	3.19	3.47
Cost of tuition and fees	3.21	3.19	3.37
Availability of aid	2.98	2.98	2.98
Availability of housing	2.77	2.76	2.88

* $\underline{P} \leq .05$

Table 18

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Academic Reputation

Response	Value	Total (N=337)	Group Enrollee (N=283)	Non-Enrollee (N=54)
Unsatisfactory	1	0	0	0
Below Average	2	1.5	1.8	0
Average	3	15.1	13.8	22.2
Above Average	4	53.4	54.1	50.0
Excellent	5	30.0	30.4	27.8
Mean		4.12	4.13	4.06
Standard Deviation		.71	.71	.71

Note. $\underline{P} = .47$. Eta squared = 0.

Table 19

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Availability of a Particular Program of Study

Response	Value	Total (N=336)	Group: Enrollee (N=283)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=53)
Unsatisfactory	1	.9	.7	1.9
Below Average	2	3.9	2.5	11.3
Average	3	10.4	9.5	15.1
Above Average	4	49.4	50.2	45.3
Excellent	5	35.4	37.1	26.4
Mean		4.15	4.20	3.83
Standard Deviation		.82	.77	1.01

Note. $\underline{P}$ = 0. Eta squared = .03.

Table 20

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Variety of Courses Offered

Response	Value	Total (N=337)	Group: Enrollee (N=283)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=54)
Unsatisfactory	1	0	0	0
Below Average	2	1.2	1.4	0
Average	3	6.8	4.9	16.7
Above Average	4	40.4	41.0	37.0
Excellent	5	51.6	52.7	46.3
Mean		4.42	4.45	4.30
Standard Deviation		.67	.66	.74

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .13 Eta squared = .01.

Table 21

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Reputation of Faculty Members

Response	Value	Total (N=332)	Group: Enrollee (N=280)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=52)
Unsatisfactory	1	.6	.4	1.9
Below Average	2	4.5	4.6	3.8
Average	3	28.0	28.2	26.9
Above Average	4	51.5	52.1	48.1
Excellent	5	15.4	14.6	19.2
Mean		3.77	3.76	3.79
Standard Deviation		.78	.77	.87

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .82. Eta squared = 0.

Table 22

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Prestige of a U of M Degree

Response	Value	Total (N=336)	Group: Enrollee (N=283)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=53)
Unsatisfactory	1	.3	.4	0
Below Average	2	4.5	3.9	7.5
Average	3	26.5	25.4	32.1
Above Average	4	45.5	47.0	37.7
Excellent	5	23.2	23.3	22.6
Mean		3.87	3.89	3.75
Standard Deviation		.83	.82	.90

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .27. Eta squared = 0.

Table 23

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Willingness to Accept Transfer Credits

Response	Value	Total (N=336)	Group Enrollee (N=282)	Non-Enrollee (N=54)
Unsatisfactory	1	4.5	5.0	1.9
Below Average	2	13.1	12.8	14.8
Average	3	36.3	35.5	40.7
Above Average	4	33.0	33.7	29.6
Excellent	5	13.1	13.1	13.0
Mean		3.37	3.37	3.37
Standard Deviation		1.01	1.03	.96

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .99. Eta squared = 0.

Table 24

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
College Entrance Requirements

Response	Value	Total (N=334)	Group Enrollee (N=281)	Non-Enrollee (N=53)
Unsatisfactory	1	1.2	1.4	0
Below Average	2	7.2	7.8	3.8
Average	3	62.3	63.7	54.7
Above Average	4	25.7	24.6	32.1
Excellent	5	3.6	2.5	9.4
Mean		3.23	3.19	3.47
Standard Deviation		.68	.67	.72

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .01. Eta squared = .02.

Table 25

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Cost of Tuition and Fees

Response	Value	Group		
		Total (N=335)	Enrollee (N=283)	Non-Enrollee (N=52)
Unsatisfactory	1	7.2	7.8	3.8
Below Average	2	11.9	12.7	7.7
Average	3	41.2	39.6	50.0
Above Average	4	31.6	32.9	25.0
Excellent	5	8.1	7.1	13.5
Mean		3.21	3.19	3.37
Standard Deviation		1.00	1.01	.90

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .24. Eta squared = 0.

Table 26

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Availability of Financial Aid

Response	Value	Group		
		Total (N=324)	Enrollee (N=275)	Non-Enrollee (N=49)
Unsatisfactory	1	4.9	5.5	2.0
Below Average	2	14.8	15.3	12.2
Average	3	61.4	59.3	73.5
Above Average	4	15.1	16.0	10.2
Excellent	5	3.7	4.0	2.0
Mean		2.98	2.98	2.98
Standard Deviation		.80	.83	.63

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .99. Eta squared = 0.

Table 27

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Opportunities for Part-time Work

Response	Value	Total (N=327)	Group: Enrollee (N=278)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=49)
Unsatisfactory	1	2.4	2.5	2.0
Below Average	2	10.1	10.4	8.2
Average	3	50.5	48.6	61.2
Above Average	4	27.5	27.7	26.5
Excellent	5	9.5	10.8	2.0
Mean		3.32	3.34	3.18
Standard Deviation		.87	.90	.70

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .25. Eta squared = 0.

Table 28

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Location of the Campus

Response	Value	Total (N=336)	Group: Enrollee (N=282)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=54)
Unsatisfactory	1	2.1	1.8	3.7
Below Average	2	7.1	6.4	11.1
Average	3	22.0	19.9	33.3
Above Average	4	39.0	39.4	37.0
Excellent	5	29.8	32.6	14.8
Mean		3.87	3.95	3.48
Standard Deviation		.99	.97	1.00

Note. $\underline{P}$ = 0. Eta squared = .03.

Table 29

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Social Climate and Campus Activities

Response	Value	Total (N=336)	Group: Enrollee (N=283)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=53)
Unsatisfactory	1	4.8	4.9	3.8
Below Average	2	18.5	20.1	9.4
Average	3	33.9	33.6	35.8
Above Average	4	29.8	29.7	30.2
Excellent	5	13.1	11.7	20.8
Mean		3.28	3.23	3.55
Standard Deviation		1.06	1.06	1.05

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .05. Eta squared = .01.

Table 30

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Availability of Housing

Response	Value	Total (N=328)	Group: Enrollee (N=278)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=50)
Unsatisfactory	1	7.9	7.9	8.0
Below Average	2	25.6	27.0	18.0
Average	3	50.6	50.0	54.0
Above Average	4	12.8	11.9	18.0
Excellent	5	3.0	3.2	2.0
Mean		2.77	2.76	2.88
Standard Deviation		.88	.88	.87

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .36. Eta squared = 0.

Table 31

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Campus Libraries

Response	Value	Total (N=333)	Group: Enrollee (N=282)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=51)
Unsatisfactory	1	1.8	1.8	2.0
Below Average	2	3.0	3.2	2.0
Average	3	22.8	22.7	23.5
Above Average	4	43.8	44.0	43.1
Excellent	5	28.5	28.4	29.4
Mean		3.94	3.94	3.96
Standard Deviation		.79	.80	.80

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .88. Eta squared = 0.

Table 32

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Labs and Other Classroom Facilities

Response	Value	Total (N=331)	Group: Enrollee (N=281)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=50)
Unsatisfactory	1	1.5	1.8	0
Below Average	2	8.5	9.6	2.0
Average	3	45.0	47.3	32.0
Above Average	4	34.1	32.7	42.0
Excellent	5	10.9	8.5	24.0
Mean		3.44	3.37	3.88
Standard Deviation		.85	.84	.80

Note. $\underline{P}$ = 0. Eta squared = .05.

Table 33

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Rating the Respondent's Impression of the
Number of Students on Campus

Response	Value	Total (N=333)	Group: Enrollee (N=282)	Group: Non-Enrollee (N=51)
Unsatisfactory	1	6.3	6.0	7.8
Below Average	2	12.9	12.4	15.7
Average	3	16.2	16.0	17.6
Above Average	4	30.9	30.5	33.3
Excellent	5	33.6	35.1	25.5
Mean		3.73	3.76	3.53
Standard Deviation		1.23	1.22	1.25

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .21. Eta squared = 0.

Table 34

Results of Factor Analysis on Impression Items

	LOADING	PERCENT OF COMMON VARIANCE
Factor I: Overall Environment		54.0
Availability of housing	.63	
Social climate and campus activities	.57	
Location of the campus	.47	
Labs and other classroom facilities	.41	
Campus libraries	.39	
Opportunities for part-time work	.35	
Number of students on campus	.33	
Subscale mean = 3.48 $\pm$ .57		
Factor II: Prestige		21.7
Prestige of a U of M degree	.82	
Academic reputation	.72	
Reputation of faculty members	.45	
Subscale mean = 3.94 $\pm$ .63		
Factor III: Availability		14.2
Variety of courses offered	.75	
Availability of a particular program of study	.63	
Campus libraries	.41	
Subscale mean = 4.18 $\pm$ .60		
Factor IV: Affordibility		10.2
Availability of financial aid	.61	
Cost of tuition and fees	.42	
Opportunities for part-time work	.41	
Willingness to accept transfer credits	.40	
Location of the campus	.30	
Subscale mean = 3.36 $\pm$ .58		

Note. N = 305

Table 35

Percentage Distribution of Grouped Responses
Describing the Most Positive or Appealing Feature
of the University of Minnesota

Response Grouping	Total (N=329)	Group Enrollee (N=277)	Non-Enrollee (N=52)
Quality/Prestige	35.9	36.5	32.7
Number of Courses/Programs	22.2	21.3	26.9
Size	20.4	22.0	11.5
Location	5.8	5.1	9.6
Facilities	4.9	4.7	5.8
Expense (low cost)	2.7	2.5	3.8
Campus Atmosphere	2.1	2.5	0
Extra-curriculars	1.2	1.1	1.9
Miscellaneous	4.9	4.3	7.7

Table 36

Percentage Distribution of Grouped Responses
Describing the Most Negative or Unappealing Feature
of the University of Minnesota

Response Grouping	Total (N=321)	Group Enrollee (N=271)	Non-Enrollee (N=50)
Impersonalness/Size	46.7	46.1	50.0
Red Tape	18.1	19.9	8.0
Quality	8.1	8.5	6.0
Expense (high cost)	6.2	5.9	8.0
Transportation Problems	3.7	4.1	2.0
Inadequate Housing	2.2	2.2	2.0
Location	1.9	1.1	6.0
Priorities	1.9	2.2	0
Advising/Guidance	1.6	1.5	2.0
Transfer Problems	1.6	1.1	4.0
Lack of Services	1.2	1.5	0
Miscellaneous	6.9	5.9	12.0

Demographic Data

Insight into the nature of the respondents can be gained from their reports of their behavior and background characteristics. Of the 57 reporting nonenrollees, 39 (68.4%) said that they did enroll at other colleges (Table 37). Of these 39 persons, over half said that they were enrolled at colleges within Minnesota. The remainder were divided among the four adjacent states (12.8%), a variety of colleges east of the Mississippi, (17.9%), and a variety of schools west of the Mississippi (15.4%). While over two thirds said that they were attending school, only one third of the nonenerollees said they had applied to a college other than the University of Minnesota (Table 38). One likely explanation for this apparent contradiction is that a number of the nonenrollees may have simply continued at their current school, or else took informal courses, and thus did really "apply" to other schools.

Among those who said they were attending other schools, a majority, 57.5%, said that they received some form of financial aid from the college they were attending. A majority of these aid recipients said they were receiving loans, and over a third were receiving a scholarship or grant (Table 39).

This finding needs to be read together with the data on how many students applied for and received aid from the U of M (Table 40). The majority of those who did not enroll also did not apply for aid (61%). An important question which cannot be answered from the data at hand is what were the reasons for their not applying. Did they not need aid? Did they not know the University might offer aid? Or did they presume that they were not eligible for aid?

Further understanding of the respondents' behavior can be gained from their reports of their incomes. Non-enrollees reported higher incomes than did enrollees (Table 41). Only 6.1% of the enrollees earned $10,000 or more per year compared to 34.65 of the nonenrollees. The two groups did not differ, however, in the size of their parents' incomes (Table 42). It might be surmised from these figures, that nonenrollees were more likely to be involved in established jobs than were enrollees. They may also have assumed that they might not be eligible for financial aid at the University and thus did not apply. Given the number receiving aid at other schools, this assumption may or may not be valid.

Other noteworthy differences between enrollees and nonenrollees were in the number of previous college credits they had earned and in their previous grade point averages. Nonenrollees earned significantly more credits in their previous work than did enrollees (Table 43). Ninety eight percent of the nonenrollees were transferring 84 or more credits, compared to only 36% of the enrollees. At the same time, the previous college grade point averages of nonenrollees were significantly lower than those of the enrollees (Table 44).

The pattern of the demographic data and reports of behavior suggest that enrollees are likely to fit the mold of the "traditional" college student, whereas many of the nonenrollees could be considered "nontraditional." The nonenrollees are probably older (as indicated by the number of credits earned), more likely to have an established job (as indicated by their incomes), and perhaps have a more difficult time devoting themselves to their coursework (as indicated by their lower GPA's).

Table 37

Percentage Distribution of States
Where Nonenrollees Attended College
(Instead of Attending the U of M)

Response	Percent Responding (n=39)
Minnesota	53.8
North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Wisconsin	12.8
All others east of the Mississippi	17.9
All others west of the Mississippi	15.4

Table 38

Percentage Distribution of Number of Colleges
Other than the U of M that Respondents Applied to

Number Applied to	Total (N=330)	Group Enrollee (N=276)	Non-Enrollee (N=54)
0	76.7	81.6	66.7
1	16.4	15.8	22.2
2	4.5	4.5	5.5
3	0.9	0.8	1.9
4	1.5	1.1	3.7
Mean	0.34	0.30	0.54
Standard Deviation	0.74	0.69	0.97

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .04. Eta squared = .01.

Table 39

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Indicating Types of Financial Aid
Nonenrollees Received From College they Attended

Response	Percent Responding (n=40)
None - not receiving aid	42.5
Scholarship/grant	37.5
Loan	52.5
Job (as part of aid)	20.0

Note. Only those nonenrollees attending a college responded to this question.

Respondents were allowed to give more than one reponse so percentages total to more than 100 percent.

Table 40

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Indicating Whether Transfer Applicants
Applied for Financial Aid at the U of M

Response	Total (N=334)	Group Enrollee (N=280)	Non-Enrollee (N=54)
Yes, and I was offered aid	33.2	36.4	16.7
Yes, but I was not offered aid	21.3	21.1	22.2
No	45.5	42.5	61.1

Table 41

Percentage Distribution of Responses
Giving the Respondent's Estimate
of Personal Income

Response	Total (N=335)	Group Enrollee (N=280)	Non-Enrollee (N=55)
$0 to $4,999	68.7	71.8	52.7
$5,000 to $9,999	20.6	22.1	12.7
$10,000 to $14,999	6.0	3.9	16.4
$15,000 to $19,999	2.4	.4	12.7
$20,000 to $24,999	1.2	1.1	1.8
$25,000 and above	1.2	.7	3.6

Table 42

Percentage Distribution of Grouped Responses
Giving the Respondent's Estimate
of Parents' Income

Response Grouping	Total (N=204)	Group Enrollee (N=168)	Non-Enrollee (N=36)
Below $10,000 to $19,999	20.2	20.8	19.4
$20,000 to $39,999	48.5	48.2	50.0
$40,000 and above	30.9	31.0	30.6

Table 43

Percentage Distribution of Transfer Credits
Upon Application to the U of M

Number of Credits	Total (N=326)	Group Enrollee (N=277)	Non-Enrollee (N=49)
12 to 83	53.7	62.8	2.0
84 to 155	42.9	34.7	89.8
More than 155	3.4	2.5	8.2
Mean	78.8	73.3	106.3
Median	78.1	72.5	96.2
Standard Deviation	59.1	35.9	117.4

Note. Assuming a 'normal' course load of 12 credits, the first grouping represents up to 6 quarters (or 2 years) of 'full-time' coursework. The second category represents 7 to 12 quarters of 'full-time' coursework. The third category represents more than 12 quarters of coursework.
$\underline{P}$ = 0. Eta squared = .04.

Table 44

Percentage Distribution of Transfer GPA
Upon Application to the U of M

GPA	Total (N=325)	Group Enrollee (N=276)	Non-Enrollee (N=49)
0.01 to 1.00	0.3	0.4	0
1.01 to 2.00	1.5	1.8	0
2.01 to 3.00	50.8	50.7	51.0
3.01 to 4.00	47.4	47.1	49.0
Mean	2.85	2.90	2.61
Median	2.94	2.94	2.91
Standard Deviation	0.82	0.72	1.17

Note. $\underline{P}$ = .02. Eta squared = .02.

DISCUSSION

The data from this study can help answer two practical questions: How can the College of Liberal Arts attract the transfer students it now loses? and How can CLA continue to attract the students who now choose to enroll?

Some answers to these questions can be suggested by developing a model of how potential transfer students make decisions about the University. The main pieces of data for constructing such a model are the following:

Enrollees	Nonenrollees
81% applied only to UM	67% were attending other schools
36% transferred more than 84 credits	98% transferred more than 84 credits
6% had personal incomes of $10000 or more	35% had personal incomes of $10000 or more.
43% did not apply for aid at UM	61% did not apply for UM aid
36% offered aid at U of M	17% offered UM aid
	58% receiving aid at other schools
More likely to have been positively influenced toward U of M by other people	Less likely to have been positively influenced toward U of M by other people

Both Enrollees and Nonenrollees

For both groups the the University's main attractions were the quality and diversity of its programs. Its main detracting factors were its size and the problems associated with that size (red tape, housing, impersonal treatment, large classes).

In forming attitudes about how the U of M/CLA compares to other schools, the most important factor was a general assessment of the campus environment, including location, housing, social climate, and numbers of students on campus. The second most important factor was a prestige factor, including the prestige of a UM degree and the reputations of the University and its faculty.

The most important sources of information for forming attitudes to inform the enrollment decision were personal impressions, gained from personal visits to the U of M and conversations with U of M representatives. The second most important set of information sources were the printed materials--catalogs, brochures, and viewbooks. (Because of the nature of the questions and analyses these data may be more reflective of enrollees than nonenrollees).

A Model of the Decision Process

The data on the previous page fit together into fairly consistent descriptions of enrollees and nonenerollees. It seems likely that many of the nonenrollees are "non-traditional" students--persons who are older, have had more college experience, and are employed in ongoing jobs. In contrast, the enrollees are more likely to be "traditional" students in the sense that they are younger, making less money, and perhaps less committed to other responsibilities besides schoolwork. Because of the response rates in the survey, assumptions about the nature of the two groups may not be accurate. But assuming that the respondents are fairly representative, one can construct a model of how student characteristics interact with attitudes and information to determine the enrollment decision. The model would be along the following lines:

Potential transfer students are initially attracted by the prestige, diversity, and dominance of the University in the state of Minnesota. The University's catalogs and brochures convey the basic information about these qualities and generally reinforce the image of the University of Minnesota as an important, prestigious university. In essence the status of the University puts it into the competition for the potential transfer student.

However, once the University is in the running, other factors become important. These factors are likely to be the environmental ones identified in the factor analyses and mentioned by the respondents in the open-ended questions. They have to do with arranging one's life to accomodate attending the University and feeling comfortable once enrolled. Thus the decision about transferring may occur in two phases. In the first the individual sorts through options on the basis of quality, program availability, and reputation, using catalogs and brochures as primary information sources. Later, once the field is defined, the person begins to look at practical, environmental questions to determine the feasibility of attending. At this point campus visits and conversations with people from the University become more important sources of information than do printed materials. The critical questions become housing, finances, credit transfer, relocation, and job possibilities.

For some applicants the answers to these questions about the University are positive. They believe they will be able to work out the logistics of attending the University with comparatively few difficulties. They will also conclude that the advantages of the size of the University (diversity, opportunity), outweigh the disadvantages (coldness, red tape). In fact, for many of these students the University may be the only school they considered as a transfer possibility (as is indicated by the number of enrollees who said that the University was the only school they applied to).

For a number of other applicants, however, the answers to the logistical questions are negative. They find that they cannot afford to come to the University, move to the Twin Cities, find reasonable housing, or give up a current job. Some may also be discouraged by the size and impersonality of the institution, occasionally directly portrayed through unresponsive treatment from University personnel.

It is likely that many of the students who give negative answers to the logistics and climate questions are non-traditional students, persons with more responsibilities and entanglements. Those who have less trouble dealing with the practical issues of transferring may be "traditional" younger students with fewer responsibilities.

Among the nonenrollees, there is reason to suspect that their negative view of the difficulties in transferring may not be well informed. One clue to this possibility is the discrepancy between the number of students who said they applied for financial aid at the University and the number who said they were receiving aid at another school. Students may be making unverified assumptions about their chances for aid at the University.

The same may be the case with respect to other aspects of the University. Although the data do not permit clear inferences on this point, many of the nonenrollees may not be getting accurate information about housing, job possibilities, and the general climate of the institution. This could be because they do not get enough first-hand, personal information about these characteristics. They may not be able to visit the campus, talk with current students, or talk with faculty about what the University is really like. Consequently they may be operating on unjustified stereotypes about the difficulties associated with attending the University.

Implications for change

The data suggest some definite ways to answer the two practical questions of how to attract more transfer students and how to keep the ones who do plan to come. First, the University should work to get potential students to personally visit the campus and talk with current students and helpful staff and faculty. These personal visits and conversations should stress the ways in which the University can be personalized and can help the student work out practical problems in housing, finances, and jobs. Some of suggestions from nonenrollees illustrate this point.

"Provide contact with a present student in the area of study transferring into."

"Stress availability of small social networks"

"Show more of the cultural activities (possibly with other universities), emphasize high academic grades and professors who spend a lot of time with students"

If efforts are made to increase personal contacts between potential transfer students and University personnel it is important to make sure that these contacts are positive ones. This has not always been the case, as noted by two of the comments of nonenrollees:

"Cut out red-tape and run around for students. Most helpers in service-type jobs are ignorant about the University as a whole and make things very difficult for information-seekers."

". . when I called regarding general information, the person I spoke with was less than enthusiastic. Keeping in mind that 'we all have our days' I found it difficult to separate an unpleasant voice with an institution."

The impersonality of the institution is a strong negative factor for all applicants, and it must be actively countered in order to persuade some applicants to attend. Anything that reinforces the impersonal image will definitely hurt.

It may not be possible to give some applicants personal contacts with University students and faculty. Communication with these persons may have to be in print or through counselors at their current schools. There was some tendency among the nonenrollees to cite counselor's advice as negative influences on their attitudes about attending the Univesity. Cultivating better relations with counselors in feeder colleges might yield some improvements in transfer enrollments.

Some new efforts in publications might also help. Current publications were highly rated for their portrayal of the University's quality of education and diverse opportunities (although one dissenting student complained about their "uppity" tone). To a lesser extent, they also convey some of the opportunity to have close personal experiences at the University.

However, publications might be able to do more to substitute for personal sources of information. In particular they might give more information about ways transfer students can cope with housing, costs, and job opportunities. These discussions should creatively discuss opportunities in a way that is accurate but still actively combats the impression that the University does not help students deal with the practical problems of studenthood. Some of these discussions might be especially targeted to the "non-traditional" student. At the same time the University's publications might do more, especially in the viewbook or transfer guide, to talk about opportunities for personal contact with faculty and other students.

In a sense, the University does not have a "problem" with transfer students. Most of the students who are accepted for transfer do enroll. Still, with the prospect of declining enrollments, it is important for the University to make itself more attractive to potential transfer students.

Some of the things which dissuade transfer students are beyond the institution's control, but this study suggests that some applicants may have an exaggerated view of the University's weaknesses and an inadequate understanding of its strengths.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of Admissions and Records
Williamson Hall
231 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA TRANSFER STUDENT STUDY: FINDING OUT WHY STUDENTS DO AND DO NOT TRANSFER

Your Decision about the U of M. Our first interest is in what went into your decision about attending the University of Minnesota.

Q-1. What was the main reason why you decided to enroll at the University of Minnesota last fall rather than somewhere else? (Write in)

_____

_____

Q-2. How did information from various sources affect your decision about attending the University of Minnesota (CLA)?

Please circle whether information from each source below increased, decreased, or had no effect on your desire to attend the U of M?

	Your Desire to Attend U of M					
	STRONGLY INCREASED	SLIGHTLY INCREASED	NO EFFECT/ DOESN'T APPLY	SLIGHTLY DECREASED	STRONGLY DECREASED	
a. University of Minnesota catalog.	1	2	3	4	5	(7)
b. U of M brochures/viewbook. .	1	2	3	4	5	
c. U of M transfer guide (tells what credits transfer) . . .	1	2	3	4	5	
d. Advice from friends at U of M	1	2	3	4	5	
e. Advice from U of M alumni (not parents).	1	2	3	4	5	
f. Advice from parents.	1	2	3	4	5	(12)
g. Advice from a counselor at your previous college. . . .	1	2	3	4	5	
h. Advice from faculty at your previous college	1	2	3	4	5	
i. Your own visits to the U of M	1	2	3	4	5	
j. Conversations with U of M faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	
k. Visits by U of M staff to your school	1	2	3	4	5	
l. Conversations with U of M admissions office.	1	2	3	4	5	(1P

Go on to page 2 ⟶

The University's Image. It would help our planning to know what image prospective students have of the University of Minnesota.

Q-3. Pretend that you are rating colleges for a college guide. How would you rate the University of Minnesota (College of Liberal Arts)?

Give the U of M:

5* Five stars if you think it's very much above average or excellent in the area compared to other 4-year colleges you have considered or know about.
4* Four stars if it's above average.
3* Three stars if it's about average compared to other schools.
2* Two stars if it's below average.
1* Only one star if it's very much below average or unsatisfactory in this area.

Don't worry if you don't know that much about the University of Minnesota. We are interested in your impressions. (Circle one rating for each characteristic.)

		University of Minnesota					
a.	Academic reputation	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	(19)
b.	Availability of a particular program of study.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
c.	Variety of courses offered.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
d.	Reputation of faculty members	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
e.	Prestige of a U of M degree	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
f.	Willingness to accept transfer credits.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	(24)
g.	[illegible]lege entrance requirements	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
h.	Cost of tuition and fees.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
i.	Availability of financial aid	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
j.	Opportunities for part-time work. . . .	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
k.	Location of the campus.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	(29)
l.	Social climate and campus activities. .	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
m.	Availability of housing	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
n.	Campus libraries.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
o.	Labs and other classroom facilities . .	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	(33)
p.	Number of students on campus.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	

Go on to page 3 ⟶

Q-4. What do you see as the most positive or appealing feature of the University of Minnesota? (Write in)

_____ (35-36)

_____

Q-5. What do you see as the University's most negative or unappealing feature? (Write in)

_____ (37-38)

_____

(Skip 39)

Q-6. If you had it to do over again, would you attend the University of Minnesota? (Circle one)

1 YES (40)

2 NO

3 DON'T KNOW

Background. For our planning, we would like to know a bit more about the characteristics of transfer students who do or do not come to the University.

Q-7. When you applied to transfer to the University of Minnesota, what other colleges did you apply to? (Write in names. Write "none" if U of M was only one.)

1._____ 3._____ (41-44)

2._____ 4._____

Q-8. Were you offered financial aid by any of these colleges?

1 YES (45)

2 NO

3 APPLIED ONLY TO U OF M

(Skip 46-51)

Q-9. When you applied for admission to the University of Minnesota, did you also apply for financial aid? (Circle one)

1 YES, AND I WAS OFFERED AID. (52)

2 YES, BUT I WAS NOT OFFERED AID.

3 NO

Go on to last page ⟶

Q-10. What would you estimate your personal income to have been this past year? (Circle one)

1 0-$4,999 (53)
2 $5,000-$9,999
3 $10,000-$14,999
4 $15,000-$19,999
5 $20,000-$24,999
6 $25,000 AND ABOVE

Q-11. What would you estimate the combined income of your parents or guardians to have been this past year? (Circle one)

1 BELOW $10,000 (54)
2 $10,000-$14,999
3 $15,000-$19,999
4 $20,000-$24,999
5 $25,000-$29,999
6 $30,000-$39,999
7 $40,000-$49,999
8 $50,000-$59,999
9 $60,000-$69,999
10 $70,000 AND ABOVE
11 NOT APPLICABLE--PARENTS DECEASED
12 NOT APPLICABLE--MY PARENTS DO NOT CONTRIBUTE TO MY EXPENSE OR DECLARE ME AS AN EXEMPTION ON THEIR INCOME TAX

Q-12. Do you have any suggestions on how the University of Minnesota (CLA) could make itself more attractive to transfer students?

_____ (55-56
_____
_____
_____

Thanks.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of Admissions and Records
Williamson Hall
231 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA TRANSFER STUDENT STUDY: FINDING OUT WHY STUDENTS DO AND DO NOT TRANSFER

Your Decision about the U of M. Our first interest is in what went into your decision about attending the University of Minnesota.

Q-1. What was the main reason you did not enroll at the University of Minnesota (College of Liberal Arts) last fall? (Write in)

_____ (5-6)

_____

Q-2. How did information from various sources affect your decision about attending the University of Minnesota (CLA)?

Please circle whether information from each source below increased, decreased, or had no effect on your desire to attend the U of M?

	Your Desire to Attend U of M					
	STRONGLY INCREASED	SLIGHTLY INCREASED	NO EFFECT/ DOESN'T APPLY	SLIGHTLY DECREASED	STRONGLY DECREASED	
a. University of Minnesota catalog.	1	2	3	4	5	(7)
b. U of M brochures/viewbook. .	1	2	3	4	5	
c. U of M transfer guide (tells what credits transfer) . . .	1	2	3	4	5	
d. Advice from friends at U of M	1	2	3	4	5	
e. Advice from U of M alumni (not parents).	1	2	3	4	5	
f. Advice from parents.	1	2	3	4	5	(12)
g. Advice from a counselor at your previous college. . . .	1	2	3	4	5	
h. Advice from faculty at your previous college	1	2	3	4	5	
i. Your own visits to the U of M	1	2	3	4	5	
j. Conversations with U of M faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	
k. Visits by U of M staff to your school	1	2	3	4	5	
l. Conversations with U of M admissions office.	1	2	3	4	5	('

Go on to page 2 ⟶

The University's Image. It would help our planning to know what image prospective students have of the University of Minnesota.

Q-3. Pretend that you are rating colleges for a college guide. How would you rate the University of Minnesota (College of Liberal Arts)?

Give the U of M:

5* Five stars if you think it's very much above average or excellent in the area compared to other 4-year colleges you have considered or know about.
4* Four stars if it's above average.
3* Three stars if it's about average compared to other schools.
2* Two stars if it's below average.
1* Only one star if it's very much below average or unsatisfactory in this area.

Don't worry if you don't know that much about the University of Minnesota. We are interested in your impressions. (Circle one rating for each characteristic.)

		University of Minnesota					
a.	Academic reputation	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	(19)
b.	Availability of a particular program of study.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
c.	Variety of courses offered.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
d.	Reputation of faculty members	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
e.	Prestige of a U of M degree	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
f.	Willingness to accept transfer credits.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	(24)
g.	College entrance requirements	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
h.	Cost of tuition and fees.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
i.	Availability of financial aid	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
j.	Opportunities for part-time work. . . .	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
k.	Location of the campus.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	(29)
l.	Social climate and campus activities. .	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
m.	Availability of housing	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
n.	Campus libraries.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	
o.	Labs and other classroom facilities . .	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	(33)
p.	Number of students on campus.	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	

Go on to page 3 ⟶

Q-4. What do you see as the most positive or appealing feature of the University of Minnesota? (Write in)

_____ (35-36)

_____

Q-5. What do you see as the University's most negative or unappealing feature? (Write in)

_____ (37-38)

_____

Q-6. Do you plan to attend the University of Minnesota in the future? (Circle one)

1 YES (39)

2 NO

3 DON'T KNOW

(Skip 40)

Background. For our planning, we would like to know a bit more about the characteristics of transfer students who do or do not come to the University.

Q-7. When you applied to transfer to the University of Minnesota, what other colleges did you apply to? (Write in names. Write "none" if U of M was only one.)

1._____ 3._____ (41-44)

2._____ 4._____

Q-8. Did you attend college this past year? (45)

1 YES → What college?_____ (46)
(Write in name)

If NO, skip to Q-10 ← 2 NO

(Skip 47)

Q-9. What types of financial aid did you receive from the college you attended this past year? (Circle all you have received) (48-51)

1 NONE — NOT RECEIVING AID

2 SCHOLARSHIP/GRANT

3 LOAN

4 JOB (AS PART OF AID PACKAGE)

Q-10. When you applied for admission to the University of Minnesota, did you also apply for financial aid? (Circle one) (52)

1 YES, AND I WAS OFFERED AID.

2 YES, BUT I WAS NOT OFFERED AID.

3 NO

Go on to last page →

Q-11. What would you estimate your personal income to have been this past year? (Circle one)

1 0-$4,999 (53)
2 $5,000-$9,999
3 $10,000-$14,999
4 $15,000-$19,999
5 $20,000-$24,999
6 $25,000 AND ABOVE

Q-12. What would you estimate the combined income of your parents or guardians to have been this past year? (Circle one)

1 BELOW $10,000 (54)
2 $10,000-$14,999
3 $15,000-$19,999
4 $20,000-$24,999
5 $25,000-$29,999
6 $30,000-$39,999
7 $40,000-$49,999
8 $50,000-$59,999
9 $60,000-$69,999
10 $70,000 AND ABOVE
11 NOT APPLICABLE--PARENTS DECEASED
12 NOT APPLICABLE--MY PARENTS DO NOT CONTRIBUTE TO MY EXPENSE OR DECLARE ME AS AN EXEMPTION ON THEIR INCOME TAX

Q-13. Do you have any suggestions on how the University of Minnesota (CLA) could make itself more attractive to transfer students?

_____ (55-56)
_____
_____
_____

Thanks.